

**LIFE BEGINS AT CONCEPTION!**



# LifeLines

*Serving the South Niagara Region*

## Welland-Port Colborne Pro-Life



P.O. Box 232, Welland, Ont. L3B 5P4  
905-714-0547 - [www.wpcprolife.com](http://www.wpcprolife.com)

**FALL 2015**

### Are Supreme Court Judges playing a political game?

In February of 2015 the Supreme Court of Canada decided that the law on prohibiting doctor-assisted suicide was invalid. It gave the government of Canada twelve (12) months to put a new law in place to allow doctor assisted suicide. The timing of this decision in an election year seems rather politically motivated. However with an election looming, none of the political parties have put any emphasis on this topic. If they are all too scared to touch this topic one has to ask then.....why has no media outlet asked any of these political parties about this, when supposedly 84% of the people in a recent poll indicated they wanted the ban on doctor assisted suicide lifted?

In the meantime, the professional medical associations across the country are extremely busy setting up policies for their members without any public consultation. Once again the main stream media is ignoring the actions being taken silently behind our backs.

Ontario's college of Physicians and Surgeons just wrote new policies in which it states that a doctor in Ontario may refuse to perform the killing of their patient, but must refer the patient to a doctor who will. In effect that means that a doctor who objects to doctor-assisted suicide (on whatever grounds) is still involved in ending the life of that patient.



Are Supreme Court judges playing a political game?	Page 1
President's Address	Page 2
Are Supreme Court judges playing a political game?- Continued.	Page 2
Ontario quietly adopts new policy forcing doctors to take part in euthanizing patients	Page 3
Belgium just euthanized a perfectly healthy woman, and the reason is completely absurd	Page 3

Welland-Port Colborne Pro-Life Association is an educational group. Our primary purpose is to educate our local Community about pro-life issues from conception to natural death. We also provide a pro-life presence in the community, and, when required, provide support to women in crisis pregnancies.



### Upcoming Event

#### Bowl-A-Thon - Fundraiser

Our Annual Bowl-A-thon will take place on Saturday November 14, 2015 at Kingsway Bowling Centre, 215 Riverside Drive. Welland. Register @ 5:30PM-Game @ 6:00PM  
Cost is a minimum of \$35, which provides for 2 games and a meal. Prizes available!

- President Annette Loeffen
- Treasurer Terry Dyson
- Community Liaison Muriel Dyson
- Secretary Becky Lee
- Membership Director Lisa Loeffen
- Youth Coordinator Angela Braun
- Director Mary Maslink
- Director Dave Harrison
- Member at Large Shirley Brooks
- Editor - Layout & Website Henk van der Wilt



Dear Fellow Pro-Lifers,

The late Archbishop Fulton J Sheen once said there were two classes of people – those who are on the Cross with Christ, and those beneath it, in contempt. Jesus gave us the Truth; it is we who are guilty of deceiving others, distorting God's Commandments, and self-deception – especially in matters of morality and spirituality. We have learned to live with political correctness, ambiguity, double meanings, and double standards. We have managed to justify our sins and make them appear harmless by using words like “reproductive rights” instead of killing the child in the womb; “euthanasia” – so-called “mercy killing” is now termed “compassion for the terminally ill”; un-chastity is “just a lifestyle”; pride and arrogance is considered “self-esteem. In living with immorality and lies we have ceased standing up for the truth and goodness. We have compromised our Christian principles and values in favour of this world.

One case in point: Monte McNaughton was the sole MPP to challenge Premier Kathleen Wynne's and convicted sex offender Benjamin Levin's sex ed curriculum. For championing the rights of parents protesting against this program which sexualizes children at a very early age, he's been labelled “homophobic”, and a “neanderthal” by Premier Kathleen Wynne. This program introduces homosexuality in Grade 3, gender fluidity, masturbation in Grade 6, anal sex in Grade 7 – it also advises Grade 7 students to carry a condom in case they engage in sexual activity. Grade 8 students learn there are 6 genders rather than 2 biological sexes: male & female. It also gives the impression that sex is solely about pleasure with nothing to do with love or marriage. When do we stand up and say: “Enough!”

Annette Loeffen

**Are Supreme Court Judges playing a political game?** Continued from page 1....

From the CBC we learned that the Supreme Court stated that: “Doctors, however, are by no means compelled to help patients end their lives. The court leaves that up to the professional colleges that regulate medicine.” (By Laura Payton, CBC News Posted: Feb 06, 2015 9:53 AM ET Last Updated: Feb 06, 2015 5:48 PM ET <http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/supreme-court-says-yes-to-doctor-assisted-suicide-in-specific-cases-1.2947487>)

One has to ask why such a small and select group of unelected, appointed individuals answerable to no one within the Supreme Court of Canada has the ability to overrule the ban on doctor-assisted suicide, yet is unable to direct the government with instructions on how to safeguard all those individuals involved. In doctor-assisted suicide it is the doctor that will have to end the life of the patient; therefore the emphasis should have been on their conscience and associated rights as well, not just that of the patients. Doctors will have to live with their actions for the rest of their natural lives, while the patients take that decision to their graves. The Supreme Court would have realized that many doctors would have their personal beliefs and that they would object to killing their patients, so why leave it to the individual medical colleges to set the policies? Could they not have foreseen that these individual policies by the medical colleges will lead to legal challenges down the road?

What happens in February 2016 if the newly formed government has not addressed the law on doctor-assisted suicide? The ban will be lifted and the country will be under a free for all just like what happened with abortion. Who will decide what “intolerable suffering” is? What qualifies as “intolerable suffering”? Is depression a form of “intolerable suffering”? Who will protect the rights of the physicians?

The Supreme Court left more questions than it answered. Are the Supreme Court Judges playing a political game? Knowing that no political party has dared to address the law on abortion, the timing of their decision, and the lack of protection for the doctors that have moral objections, was their decision on doctor-assisted suicide politically motivated?

**Henk van der Wilt**





TORONTO, September 17, 2015 (LifeSiteNews) -- Ontario's governing body for doctors issued an official policy last week that forces doctors unwilling to kill patients or help them commit suicide to directly refer them to a doctor who would. The policy, titled Planning for and Providing Quality End-of-Life Care, was quietly released by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario September 10, seven months after Canada's highest court ruled that doctors could actively participate in bringing about the deaths of their patients. Patients cannot request death until the ruling comes into effect February 2016.

In the "managing conflicts" section dealing with "conscientious objection," the College's new policy at first glance appears to allow for a doctor to refuse to participate in killing a patient, stating: "Physicians who limit their practice on the basis of moral and/or religious grounds must comply with the College's Professional Obligations and Human Rights policy."

But the College's Professional Obligations and Human Rights policy to which doctors must comply when refusing a service because of a conscientious or religious-based objection stipulates that such doctors make "an effective referral to another health-care provider."

Lawyers such as Larry Worthen and Albertos Polizogopoulos have argued that forcing a doctor to refer a patient is as "morally problematic" as doing the procedure itself.

"If a physician has the moral or religious conviction that abortion or euthanasia is the taking of an innocent human life, then the physician who formally refers a patient to the abortionist or euthanist has contributed to the taking of that life," they argued in an article on the topic published on LifeSiteNews in December.

Worthen told LifeSiteNews that while the new policy governs the current time period, prior to the February 6 date when the euthanasia and assisted suicide ban is lifted, he wondered if the College might revisit the policy at that time to deal with the changed legal landscape.

The current policy, however, appears to be written with the changed legal landscape in mind, stating that once the ban against doctors killing patients is ended, then "physician-assisted death will be legally permitted" for "competent adults who have a grievous and irremediable medical condition and who clearly consent to the termination of life." The College has stated that doctors who refuse to comply with the "effective referral" policy could find themselves standing before a human rights' tribunal where they could face substantial fines.

Sean Murphy, administrator of Protection of Conscience Project, called the policy of mandatory referral "erroneous" and "dangerous." "It establishes the principle that a learned or privileged class, a profession or state institutions, can legitimately compel people to do what they believe to be wrong, even gravely wrong — even killing people — and punish them if they refuse. It purports to entrench a 'duty to do what is wrong' in medical practice," he told LifeSiteNews.

### **Belgium just euthanized a perfectly healthy woman, and the reason is completely absurd**

September 16, 2015 (NationalReview) -- The Belgian euthanasia juggernaut continues to cut a terrible swath. Now, a woman was euthanized shortly after she learned her daughter was dead. From the News.Com.Au story:

FIVE minutes after Simona de Moor heard her daughter had died from a heart attack, she decided she wanted to end her life, too. The 85-year-old mother, who was considered healthy by doctors and was not taking any medication, made arrangements to be quietly put to death.

What is really astonishing to me is that a reporter would watch, and merely report, about something this evil and wrong. "I have no doubt Simona wanted to die that day. But I can't help but wonder if she'd feel the same in a few months when the initial shock and pain of her daughter's death has lessened."

Exactly. This was a heartless, profound abandonment of a suffering, despairing woman.

We are devolving into a world in which the only thing that matters is consent. No morals. No ethics.

No righteousness. This isn't how assisted suicide/euthanasia starts. But it is where society goes—fueled by the high octane of human logic—once a society accepts killing as an acceptable answer to human suffering.

Reprinted with permission from National Review.

